DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 518 SP 016 388

AUTHOR Licata, Joseph W.
TITLE Custodial Teacher Social Types.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MFC1/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classification; Classroom Communication; *Classroom Techniques; Discipline; Elementary Education; *Labeling (of Persons); Student Behavior; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

Two types of teacher behavior were elicited from student responses to the Pupil Control Behavior Form (PCB). Two custodial teacher types emerged from the data: the "screamer" type, described as a teacher who controlled pupil behavior with verbal methods that expressed anger or frustration; and the "cold fish" type, depicted as a teacher who controlled students by withholding praise and acceptance of their behavior. Test methodology, tables, and references are included. (Author/CJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190518

CUSTODIAL TEACHER SOCIAL TYPES

by

Joseph W. Licata
Assistant Professor

Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

September, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph W. Licata

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP016388

ABSTRACT

The responses of 216 elementary school students to the Pupil Control Behavior Form (PCB), an instrument designed to measure student perceptions of their teachers' pupil control behavior were subjected to a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation to resolve for simple structure and determine possible teacher social types. The emergent typology suggested two possible custodial teacher social types accounting for approximately 80 percent of the PCB test variance. The "screamer" type, accounting for 74 percent of the variance and composed of four items, seemed to describe a teacher who effects pupil control through verbal behavior, behavior which sometimes expresses anger or frustration. The "cold fish" type accounting for 12 percent of the variance and composed of seven items, seemed to depict a teacher who elicits pupil control by withholding praise and acceptance of student behavior. The researcher tentatively verified two custodial teacher social types were verified through t-tests of PCB, "screamer" and "cold fish" independent mean scores for teachers judged by the school's administrators to be examples of these two teacher social types and the other teachers in the study.

CUSTODIAL TEACHER SOCIAL TYPES

The study of social types, which originated seriously with Louis Writh's (1926) investigation of Jewish ghetto types and Samual Strong's (1943) of Negro types, is represented in a contempary sense by Orrin Klapp's (1962) characterization of "heroes, villains and fools." In schools, as in other social institutions, social types are consensual or collective constructs of role norms and models from specific as well as generalized social positions (Klapp, 1958). For instance, a "tattle-tale" in the student subculture is a group member who in the view of peers routinely violates a group norm against providing a superordinate with information which might subject another member of the group to negative organizational sanctions. A "mother hen" in the teacher subculture is probably a member who displays overly maternalistic relationships with a particular group of students or students in general. Klapp (1958) has described four key structural-functional elements of social typing.

First, social typing provides for a finer descrimination of role than the formal organization recognizes. It is information about an organizational role which often serves as a subtitute for really knowing the person taking that role (Klapp, 1958). For example, assistant principals may be strict disciplinarians but

Assistant Principal X is a "nice guy". A student who is referred to the assistant principal's office for alleged misconduct probably hopes that this additional information will serve to make his forthcoming interaction with the assistant principal more predictable - and often it does exactly that.

Second, social types define emerging roles within a social system and thus play a role in the development of social structure (Klapp, 1958). "Alligator bags" emerged as student social types in a particular school in Pennsylvania. The "alligator bags" were students who helped an overzealous physical education teacher combat student cigarette smoking in the school lavoratories. Under the teacher's leadership they would crash into lavoratories in an attempt to catch smokers, once destroying a door. They would inform school authorities about new "hideouts" employed by student smokers. The type was reminiscent of Klapp's (1949) "high minded fool" who plunges into troubles that more pragmatic, down-to-earth persons would try to avoid. Student smokers used the "alligator bag" characterization to mock their student adversaries. While alligator hide is pretty tough, "alligator bags" were allegedly only "pseudo-tough" individuals.

A third function of social typing is to assign persons within the social system with informal status resulting in social control (Klapp, 1954). Klapp suggests that social types have either a heroic, a villianous or foolish connotation and the individual

typed is treated accordingly. In this way, to call a student an "alligator bag" or a "stool-pidgeon" within the student subculture or to call a teacher a "bleeding heart" or a "yes man" within the teacher subculture invokes a certain amount of derision which tends to discourage the behaviors normally expected from these types.

A fourth function of social typing is the development of self concepts through self-typing and role-models. As the type becomes a basic component of an individual's personality structure, it influences the individual's disposition to certain norms or groups within the social system (Klapp, 1958). In schools, a teacher who views himself as a "hard-nosed disciplinarian" is probably not likely to embrace innovations which may threaten his ability to discipline students or to support the younger more idealistic teachers who enforce less rigid standards of student discipline (Willower and Jones, 1967).

Purpose

In terms of educational research, study of the typing process has been limited and largely concerned with the desciption of teacher (McGill, 1926 and Walker, 1932) and administrator (Spencer and Walters, 1971) stereotypes. However, Klapp (1958) has distinguished between stereotypes which portray a role in terms of inaccurate popularizations and social types which provide relatively realistic descriptions of roles within a social

system. The purpose of this study is to determine possible teacher social types through factor analysis of an instrument which measures student perceptions of their teachers' pupil control behavior. Further, an attempt is made to verify the typology in terms of the judgments of school administrators as a second reference group or perspective.

Method

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 216 fourth, fifth and sixth grade students (three classes from each grade) attending an elementary school in South Georgia with a total enrollment of 480. All students were from self-contained classrooms. The school is classified as rural, but the student body is generally from the fringe area of a small city. The sample represented a variety of socio-economic backgrounds with the largest percentage of the children coming from the middle to low income families. The racial mix was approximately thirty percent black, seventy percent white. Since the investigator conducted the study late in the school year and no faculty changes had occurred, the students had been with their teachers for virtually the entire school year.

Administration

The investigator administered the instruments in the absence of the classroom teacher as part of a larger study to examine the relationship between teacher pupil control behavior, student

brinkmanship, and environmental robustness (Brown, 1978). Due to the variability in student reading skills, the researcher read the instruments to the students. Students responded to the forms anonymously. All instruments were completed correctly. The investigator collected the data during May, 1977.

Instrumentation

The Pupil Control Behavior (PCB) Form is a twenty-item instrument which employs student perceptions to measure teachers' pupil control behavior on a custodial-humanistic continuum (Helsel and Willower, 1973). Custodial PCB items are operationalized in terms of teacher behaviors which emphasize the maintenance of order, distrust of students, and a punitive, moralistic approach to pupil control. Humanistic PCB items are operationalized in terms of teacher behaviors which stress an accepting, trustful view of students and optimism concerning their ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. Examples of items included: MY TEACHER ... "threatens to punish students" (custodial), "gets angry at students" (custodial), "is friendly with students" (humanistic), and " treats students as if they were as good as adults in school" (humanistic). The response categories for custodial items are weighted 5,4,3,2, and 1 for "always", "often", "sometimes", "seldom", "never". Scoring is reversed for items reflecting the humanistic behavior style.

The score range of the instrument is from 20-100; the higher the score, the more custodial the perceived behavior.

During the initial development of the PCB, item-scale reliability coefficients for the twenty PCB items ranged from .68 to .93 with an average of .81. An additional reliability analysis of the PCB yielded an alpha coefficient of .92. The developers assessed discriminent validity through an analysis of variance comparing two variance estimates which revealed significantly less variation among respondents describing the same teachers than among descriptions of different teachers. They demonstrated construct validity through significant positive correlations between the PCB and the Pupil Control Ideology Form for teachers, counselors, principals and all educators combined (Helsel and Willower, 1975).

Data Analyses

Consistent with the purposes of this investigation the researcher employed two types of data analyses. First, the investigator subjected responses to the twenty-item PCB instrument to a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation procedure to resolve for simple structure. With respect to the nature of the PCB scoring continum which assigns the highest scores for custodial responses, the investigator decided to initially interpret the factor structure in terms of "custodial" teacher social types." The investigator made a decision to retain only those factors

accounting for ten percent or more of the test variance. Second, the investigator asked the two school administrators from the sample school to determine whether of not any of the nine teachers involved in the study predominantly exhibited behaviors associated with a particular social type identified in the factor analysis of the PCB. The investigator employed t-tests to examine differences in student perceptions of these judged custodial teacher social types and other teachers in this study.

Results

Major findings of this study are reported below in two sections. The first section summarizes the results of the PCB form factor analysis employed to identify possible custodial teacher social types. The second section describes the verification of identified teacher social types in terms of t-tests based on the judgements of two school administrators from the sample school involved in this study.

Factor Analysis

Results of the principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded only two salient factors for the PCB form. The two factors accounted for approximately 72 percent and 12 percent of the test variance respectively, 84 percent of the cumulative test variance. Based on these results, the investigator structured a decision rule for realigning and retaining items for a two factor

version of the instrument. The investigator eliminated items failing to load .30 or greater on either factor. He made the decision to eliminate items loading on both factors, if the difference between their respective loadings was less than .10. In keeping with the assumptions of orthagonality, the investigator retained items loading in a bipolar manner and placed them on the factor having their heaviest loading.

With the application of these decision criteria, only eleven of the original twenty items survived to represent the two factor version of the PCB form. Table 1 presents a summary of the significantly weighted PCB items for each of the two factors resulting from the factor analysis as well as the direction and magnitude of their respective loadings. Eigen values for each factor are stated below each factor name.

(Table 1 goes about here)

The first factor, accounting for approximately 72 percent of the test variance, is composed of four items which appear to describe a teacher who uses verbal behavior, sometimes expressing anger or frustration, to control students. The four items suggest that this type of teacher "--- gets upset when students are noisy," "--- threatens to punish students," "--- gets angry at students," and "--- is bossy with students." While not totally congruent with the four descriptors, the emergent factor or social type was somewhat reminiscent of "the screamer" type known to educators

in South Georgia, the area in which the study took place. In the absence of specific knowledge about actual labels for teacher social types in the particular social system in which the data were collected, the author decided to tentatively name this factor after "the screamer" type. Loadings for items representative of "the screamer" teacher social type ranged from .44 to .68 with an average loading of .52.

The second factor, accounting for approximately 12 percent of the test variance, is represented by seven items which appear to descibe a teacher who probably maintains strict social distance between himself and students, enforcing pupil control by withholding or withdrawing support, acceptance, and praise. The seven items suggest that this type of teacher "--- is not cheerful and pleasant," "--- is not friendly with students," "--- does not say nice things to students," "--- is not easy for students to talk with," "--- does not smile when students are around," "--- does not treat students as if they were as good as adults in school," and "--- does not find time to listen to student problems." The author tentatively named this factor or social type "the cold fish" after a classic type popularly known as such in a variety of organizational settings. Loadings for items representative of the "cold fish" teacher social type ranged from .45 to .62 with an average loading of .56.

Verification

The investigator accomplished the identification of the "screamer" and "cold fish" teacher social types through factor analysis of student perceptions of their teachers' pupil control behavior. In order to verify these teacher social types through another organizational perspective, the researcher presented the information from table 1 to the principal and assistant principal from the sample school. He asked these administrators to consider the "screamer" and the "cold fish" teacher social types in terms of the classroom behavior normally exhibited by the nine teachers involved in the study and to determine whether or not any of these teachers predominantly exhibited behaviors attributed to these two teacher social types. While it was possible for the two school administrators to respond that none of the nine teachers could be described as examples of either social type, the school administrators judged two of the teachers to be "screamer" types and another to be a "cold fish" type.

In order to determine the degree of agreement between student and administrator perceptions of the custodial teacher social typology which emerged from factor analysis, the author made three descriptive comparisons based on the two administrators' judgments and student responses to the PCB. First, he compared student perceptions of the three teachers identified as custodial teacher

social types by their school administrators to the remaining six teachers in the study using a t-test of independent PCB mean scores. Second, the researcher compared student perceptions of the two teachers identified as "screamers" to student perceptions of the other seven teachers in the study using a t-test of independent "screamer" dimension mean scores. He summed scores for the four items representing the "screamer" dimension to produce a dimension ranging from 4-20 with a high score connoting "screamer" behavior. Third, the investigator compared the student perceptions of the teacher identified as a "cold fish" to the student perceptions of the remaining eight teachers in the study using a t-test of independent "cold fish" dimension mean scores. He summed the scores for the seven items representing the "cold fish" dimension to produce a dimension ranging from 7-35 with a high score connoting "cold fish" behavior. Table 2 presents the results of these analyses.

(Table 2 goes about here)

Based on student perceptions, the teachers judged "screamers" and "cold fish" by administrators, as a group, had a significantly higher or more custodial mean PCB score than the other teachers in the study. The mean PCB score for the judged custodial teacher social types was 58.69 and the mean PCB score for other teachers was 55.02 ($t=2.20$, $p=.05$; $df=214$). The mean "screamer" scores for the two teachers judged "screamers" and all other teachers involved in the study were 14.13 and 12.41 respectively. In terms of student

perceptions, the judged "screamers" had a significantly higher mean score on the "screamer" dimension than the other seven teachers involved in the study ($t=3.30$, $p=.01$; $df=214$). The mean "cold fish" dimension scores for the teacher judged a "cold fish" and the other eight teachers in the study were 20.84 and 17.89 respectively. With respect to student perceptions, the results indicate that the judged "cold fish" had a significantly higher mean score on the "cold fish" dimension than the other eight teachers involved in the study ($t=2.51$, $p=.05$; $df=214$).

Discussion

The initial purpose of this investigation was to determine possible custodial teacher social types through a factor analysis of student responses to the PCB form, an instrument which measures student perceptions of their teachers' pupil control behavior. As a result of this analysis, two possible teacher social types emerged accounting for approximately 80 percent of the test variance. The four PCB items descriptive of the "screamer" type account for over two-thirds of the PCB variance and appear to describe a teacher who effects pupil control through verbal behavior, behavior which sometimes expresses anger or frustration. On the other hand, the seven PCB items descriptive of the "cold fish" type account for slightly less than one-eight of the PCB variance and seem to depict a teacher who elicits pupil control by withholding praise and acceptance of student behavior. It should be noted that the eigen value for the "cold fish"

dimension was less than 1.00 suggesting a possible single factor interpretation of the PCB composed of only four items.

While the two custodial teacher social types emerged from a factor analysis based on student perceptions, school administrators apparently were able to identify two "screamers" and a "cold fish" among the nine teachers involved in the study. Based on their judgments, the identified teacher social types as a group had a significantly more custodial mean PCB score than the other teachers in the study. Judged "screamers" as a group had a significantly higher mean score on the "screamer" dimension than other teachers in the study. The judged "cold fish" had a significantly higher mean score on the "cold fish" dimension than other teachers in the study. These analyses apparently suggest that the two custodial teacher social types can be verified in terms of student and administrator, or subordinate and superordinate perceptions of teacher behavior. At least in terms of the school's administrators, the relatively accurate identification of teacher social types from a rather small teacher sample may indicate that the "screamer" and "cold fish" are meaningful role norms or models in that particular school organization.

Conclusion

At this point, it may be interesting to engage in some speculation about certain structural-functional aspects of the "screamer" and "cold fish" typology for specific subgroups in the school organization. With respect to the student subculture,

previous studies (Pritchett and Willower, 1975, Brown, 1978 and Willower, Multauf and Licata, 1978) suggest that in certain school organizations the custodial dimension of the PCB is generally related to negative student attitudes about their teacher and their school. Keeping this in mind, the "screamer" and the "cold fish" may be viewed by students in terms of Klapp's (1954 and 1962) villain or fool categories. Students' perceptions of villain and fool teacher types may produce a degree of student consensus or solidarity in the face of student-teacher antagonism (Waller, 1932, Willower and Jones, 1967, Licata and Willower 1975). As such, students are able to identify teachers they feel are foolish and not to be taken seriously or teachers they feel are villainous and deserving of cautious resistance or avoidance.

It is probably just as interesting to speculate about how the "screamer" and the "cold fish" types are viewed by the school's professional staff. Are they considered hero types because of their rigid adherence to norms for pupil control within the teacher subculture? Or, perhaps, are they considered overzealous or overconforming villains or fools? If the latter is true, then the "screamer" and the "cold fish" types may act as social control mechanisms among teachers and possibly administrators by evoking pressure against those who go overboard in attempting to maintain pupil control.

It is important to note that the findings of this study should be considered tentative given its exploratory mission and speculative orientation. Limitations involving the nature and size of the sample investigated should be recognized. Further, the author investigated one end of the pupil control behavior continuum in this study, the custodial portion. The emergent custodial teacher typology could easily be viewed as being suggestive of certain opposite or more humanistic teacher social types. Future studies might examine these humanistic counter-types, particularly in terms of their relationship to various structural features of the school organization.

While this investigation did lead to a tentative description of possible custodial teacher social types and the verification of these types through student and administrator perceptions and judgments, many questions still remain unanswered. What about student and administrator social types? Does Klapp's (1954 and 1962) hero, villain and fool typology make sense in terms of the perceptions of various reference groups in the school? How is educational innovation effected by the social typing process? Certainly, the field study method may prove a particularly fruitful vehicle for generating further insight into the nature of the social typing process and its consequences for the school organization. Such insight may hold important implications for organizational development and educational change.

References

Brown, Ralph E. Pupil control behavior, student brinkmanship and environmental robustness. Unpublished thesis, Valdosta State College, 1978.

Helsel, Ray and Willower, Donald. Toward definition and measurement of pupil control behavior. Journal of Educational Administration, 1974, 12, pp. 114-123.

Klapp, Orrin E. Heroes, Villains and Fools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

_____. Social types, process and structure. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, pp. 674-678.

_____. Heroes, villains, and fools as agents of social control. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, pp. 54-62.

_____. The fool as a social type. American Journal of Sociology. 1949, 69, pp. 157-162.

Licata, Joseph and Willower, Donald. Student Brinkmanship and the school as a social system. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1975, 11, pp. 1-14.

McGill, Kenneth. The school teacher stereotype. Journal of Educational Sociology, 9, June 1931 pp. 110-115.

Spencer, Ralph E. and Walters, Donald L. A study of attitudes toward negative administration seterotypes. The Journal of Educational Research, 65, September 1971, pp. 31-34.

Strong, Samual M. Social types in a minority group: formulation of a method. American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 48. pp. 563-573.

Waller, Willard. Sociology of Teaching, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932.

Willower, Donald, Maulthauf, Arleen and Licata, Joseph. Teacher pupil control ideology and behavior and classroom enviro nmental robustness. Elementary School Journal, September, 1978.

_____. and Jones, R.G. Control in an educational organization. Studying Teaching, J.D. Raths, et al. (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Wirth, Louis, Some Jewish types of personality. Publications of the American Sociological Society, 1926, 32, pp. 90-96.

Table 1. PCB Factor Analysis: Custodial Teacher Social Types.

Factors	PCB Items*	Loadings	Pupil Control Mechanism
The "Screamer"	---gets upset when students are noisy	.44	The "screamers" verbal behavior, sometimes expressing anger or frustration, is used as the central means of enforcing pupil control.
	---threatens to punish students	.51	
(Eigen value = 5.25)	---gets angry at students	.68	
	---is bossy with students	.46	
The "Cold Fish"	---is not cheerful and pleasant	.61	The "cold fish" maintains rigid social distance between himself and students, pupil control is enforced at least in part by withholding or withdrawing support, acceptance, and praise.
	---is not friendly with students	.62	
(Eigen value = 0.87)	---does not say nice things to students	.45	
	---is not easy for students to talk with	.52	
	---does not smile when students are around	.53	
	---does not treat students as if they are as good as adults in school	.50	
	---does not find time to listen to student problems	.56	

*Items representative of the "cold fish" factor were stated positively on the PCB, but are stated negatively here to reflect the reversed scoring employed with these items.

Table 2. Comparisons of PCB, Screamer Dimension, and Cold Fish Dimension Mean Scores for Judged Teacher Social Types and Other Teachers.

Comparison One	PCB				
	X	S.D.	N	t	p[1]
Judged "Screamers and Cold Fish" (3)[2]	58.69	11.18	72		
The Other Teachers (6)	55.02	12.32	144	2.20	.05
Comparison Two	**Screamer Dimension**				
	X	S.D.	N	t	p
Judged "Screamers" (2)	14.13	3.39	47		
The Other Teachers (7)[3]	12.41	3.08	169	3.30	.01
Comparison Three	**Cold Fish Dimension**				
	X	S.D.	N	t	p
Judged "Cold Fish" (1)	20.84	5.24	25		
The Other Teachers (8)[4]	17.89	5.56	191	2.51	.05

[1]Two-tailed test for significance.
[2]Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of teachers represented.
[3]Includes the judged "cold fish"
[4]Includes the judged "screamers"